



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,933	11/09/2001	Marc L. Aronson	20134-2	4793

572 7590 05/28/2003

CLIFFORD A. POFF
9800B MCKNIGHT ROAD
SUITE 115
PITTSBURGH, PA 15237

EXAMINER

HENCE, ANDREA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2854

DATE MAILED: 05/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/008,933

Applicant(s)

ARONSON, MARC L.

Examiner

Andrea A. Hence

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb (4,353,521) in view of Mitsubishi (JP 0121755).

Webb shows an anti-theft device that includes all of the limitations recited in claims 1-10. Referring to claim 1, Webb shows a lock apparatus including the combination of locking heads (20, 49) having upstanding anchor walls (inside walls of vertical members of (49)) protruding from a back wall (side walls of vertical members of (49)) such that the anchor walls of one locking head (49) receive a tangible object and the anchor walls (34) of the other locking head (20); struts (42), (44) for connecting said locking heads in a space apart relation with said anchor walls extending toward each other; and a lock (56) for interlocking said locking heads in a spaced apart relation between said struts. Webb does not teach use of a hand stamping device in combination with the lock. However, Webb teaches use of the lock with flanged objects. Mitsubishi teaches a hand stamp with a lock mechanism. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Webb such that a hand stamp is secured by the lock mechanism in order to obstruct movement of the stamp as taught by Mitsubishi.

Referring to claims 2 and 3, Webb shows the lock apparatus further including releasably interconnecting tab and slot connectors (32), (52) carried by one of said locking heads (20) and one of said struts (42) for receiving said lock.

Referring to claim 4, Webb shows the lock apparatus wherein said struts (42), (44) are integral with one of said locking heads (49).

Referring to claims 5 and 8, Webb shows the lock apparatus wherein said anchor walls (inside walls of vertical members of (49)) extend in a parallel spaced apart relation from one of said locking heads (20).

Referring to claim 6, Webb shows a lock apparatus wherein anchor walls (inside walls of vertical members of (49)) extend in a converging angular relation from one of said locking heads (49).

Referring to claim 7, Webb shows the lock apparatus wherein the anchor walls of said one locking head (20) have an extending length for protruding into such a frame cavity. Webb does not teach that the frame cavity is a distance sufficient to prevent movement of the stamp. Mitsubishi teaches providing a frame cavity (1 and 7) at a distance sufficient to prevent movement of the stamp. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Webb such that the frame cavity is at a distance sufficient to prevent movement of the stamp such that downward movement of the frames is obstructed as taught by Mitsubishi.

Referring to claim 9, Webb shows a lock apparatus wherein said back wall of said other locking head (49) is defined by a length and width.

Referring to claim 10, Webb shows the lock apparatus wherein said back wall of said other locking head (49) is defined by a length and width and wherein anchor walls (inside walls of vertical members of (49)) of one locking head have an extending length.

Conclusion

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea A. Hence whose telephone number is (703) 305-8427. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday; 8:30a-5:30p.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on (703) 305-6619. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2854

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Andrea A. Hence

AAH
May 19, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew H. Hirshfeld", is written over a rectangular stamp.

**ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**